

Docket No.: SAN7-253

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 29 2008

REMARKS

Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of this application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 for allegedly being unpatentable over Morrison, Lehan and Hughes. Claims 8 and 16 were rejected under the same statute over the foregoing combination in view of Tsukasa. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Morrison does not disclose the shape of the plasma tube and magnets moving over the target, but according to the Examiner a person of skill in the art would use the plasma racetrack taught in Lehan as the plasma tube in Morrison in order to gain the advantages of reduced erosion of the end portions of the target while not reducing the magnetic field and thus maintaining magnetron efficiency.

It is respectfully submitted that Lehan, however, does not refer to a planar but to a rotatable magnetron (as set forth in, e.g., the abstract). A rotatable magnetron has a completely different construction and thus has different characteristics. The plasma racetracks and the values " ω_L " and " ω_p ", therefore, only refer to a tubular magnetron.

Claims 1 and 2 describe relative movement between target and magnet systems, having at least one inner magnet and at least one outer magnet. Such a system is not disclosed or suggested by Lehan. This is important, however, because the terms B, d, W and C are only obtained by this system. The plasma tube is thereby arranged around the inner magnet 4 (see Fig. 1 of the present application), not around a magnet portion 32 of a cylindrical magnetron 30 (see Fig. 3 of Lehan). Thus, because Lehan refers to a cylindrical magnetron, a person of skill in the art would not combine Lehan and Morrison as alleged by the Examiner.

The Examiner also combines Morrison with Hughes, but does so in a piecemeal fashion; claim 1 cannot be divided into several parts. In claim 1 the magnet system has a special